



# **NCDOT – Joint Legislative Transportation Oversight Committee**

**December 14, 2010**



**MOBILITYFUND**  
NORTH CAROLINA



## **NC Mobility Fund**

**Session Law 2010-31, Section 28.7**

### **Stakeholders required in project criteria and selection process**

- General Public
- NC Metropolitan Planning Organizations
- NC Rural Planning Organizations
- NC League of Municipalities
- NC Association of County Commissioners
- NC Metropolitan Mayors Coalition
- NC Councils of Regional Government

**October 1, 2010 → Preliminary Report on selection criteria to  
Joint Legislative Oversight Committee (JLTOC)**

**December 14, 2010 → Final Report to JLTOC**





## Project Selection

- **Phase II of Yadkin River Bridge/I-85 widening project will be first project (#1 mobility need) – est. \$120M**
- **Preferential consideration given to Congestion Relief and Intermodal Transportation 21st Century Fund eligible projects**
- **All modes are eligible**





## Funding

**Sources: Phased Elimination of Highway Trust Fund (HTF) transfers & limited unused toll project gap funds**

**New dollars (not subject to Equity Formula) that will help entire State**

**Phased in over 4 years**

**Amounts:**

FY 11	FY 12	FY 13	FY 14+
\$39 M	\$31M	\$45M	\$58M

(Total through FY 14 = \$173M)







## **Inclusive / Collaborative Process**

- 1. Public Input – *Two 30-day comment periods***
  - Received comments from ~100 individuals/organizations
- 2. Work Group**
  - Extensive input from key partners/stakeholders

### **Project Criteria & Selection Process Proposals**

- Minimum Project Requirements
- Scoring Option 1 – Needs-based Approach
- Scoring Option 2 – Cost-benefit Approach





## Feedback from Comment Periods

- Consensus for Minimum Eligibility Project Requirements
- Lack of Consensus for Either Option

### Conflicting Comments on Scoring Factors

Example: Two biggest transit operators had a difference of opinion

Example: Split decision on use of safety in scoring

### Some Consensus on Common Factors from Both Options

Example: travel time savings, multimodal, leverage of funds, benefit-cost, economic impact





## Key Input from Work Group

- Stick as closely to the legislative requirements as possible.
- Process to score and rank projects should be easy to understand and reproducible.
- Different modes of transportation should compete well.
- The true need for the project should outweigh the project cost.





## Minimum Eligibility Project Requirements

- Projects must be on Statewide or Regional Tier facilities (“Tier” designation is defined by the Department). Light rail, bus rapid transit and commuter rail projects are all eligible for Mobility Funds.
- Projects must be ready to have funds obligated for construction within 5 years.
- Projects must be consistent with MPO/RPO transportation planning efforts; must be included in an adopted transportation plan; and must be found to be consistent with local land-use plans where available.
- Projects must be in a conforming transportation plan in non-attainment or maintenance areas.
- Only project capital costs (right of way and construction) will be eligible for the Mobility Fund, not maintenance, operation or planning costs.
- No minimum project capital cost will be established as a threshold for funding .







## Final Criteria & Weights

CRITERIA	WEIGHT	DESCRIPTION
<b>Mobility / Congestion</b>	<b>60%</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Measured by travel time savings (in vehicle hours)</li> <li>• Used to compare projects across transportation modes</li> </ul>
<b>Multimodal</b>	<b>20%</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes / No question</li> <li>• Project improves more than one mode of travel</li> </ul>
<b>Intermodal Fund – Preferential Consideration</b>	<b>20%</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes / No question</li> <li>• Project meets requirements of the Intermodal &amp; Congestion Relief Fund</li> </ul>

***Note: Project Scoring will occur on a 0 to 100 point scale***



## Final Criteria and Weights

### Mobility/Congestion (Travel Time Savings) - 60%

- Measured by travel time savings with and without the project based on current conditions
- Savings multiplied by number of users and measured for 30 years
- Benefits are captured in a way which can be compared across modes
- Work Group believed this criteria highly relevant to primary purpose of legislation





## Final Criteria and Weights

### Multimodal - 20%

- Yes / No question (eligibility)
- Project directly benefits more than one mode of transportation
- Improves efficiency of the transportation system by providing choices
- Scoring done on a sliding scale, if eligible

### Examples:

- HOV / HOT lanes
- Transit
- Ferries
- Runway Extension
- Freight Rail





## Final Criteria and Weights

### Congestion and Intermodal Fund - 20%

- Preferential consideration directed by legislation
- No specific weight identified in the legislation
- Project must meet eligible criteria (ex. housing plan for transit projects)







## Other Key Criteria Considered But Not Included

### Funding Leverage

- % Contribution of non-Mobility dollars to lessen the overall cost of the project
- Opportunity to stretch limited Mobility Fund dollars to deliver projects
- Helps bring new dollars to the table

### Why not included?

- Not explicitly stated as a consideration in the legislation
- “Pay to play” concept vs. true need for the project based on data
- Possible urban vs. rural area concern





## Other Key Criteria Considered But Not Included

### Economic Impact

- Proposed nationally recognized tool - TREDIS
- Measure the quantitative impact of the transportation investment i.e., jobs created, salaries increased, economic ripple effect
- Relieving congestion improves attractiveness & business climate

### Why not included?

- Difficult to equate economic impact in one area versus another  
50 jobs = big benefits to one community but small benefits to another
- Confidence & explanation of model outputs still a concern





## NEXT STEPS

- BOT Approved Final Criteria and Selection Process (Dec. 8<sup>th</sup>)
- Candidate projects to be submitted in Spring 2011 and will be evaluated, ranked and programmed by the Department.
- Continue Work Group meetings as needed

